

THE RĀMOPĀKHYĀNA AND THE RĀMĀYAṆA

Several studies in the past one hundred years have shown that the Rāmopākhyāna (*Mahābhārata* 3.258-275) has many passages in common with the Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa (hereafter abbreviated R) and Sukthankar correctly concludes<sup>1</sup> that it is a condensation of the R. Elsewhere Sukthankar states, « *A priori*, then, whenever our Mahābhārata shows close *verbal* agreement with the *older* books of the Rāmāyaṇa, the presumption would be that we have to look upon the Rāmāyaṇa as the source... ». Since Sukthankar wrote these words, a critical edition of the R has appeared which enables us to examine even more closely the points of correspondence between the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa. Its critical apparatus furnishes us with a wealth of variant readings from manuscripts hailing from all over India and Nepal. Those combined with the readings of the less copious variants of the Mahābhārata's critical edition should enable us to come to an accurate understanding of the relationship between the two stories, as well as in a more general sense, the interdependence of the two epics in their earlier stages.

In the present study I have compared those passages of the Rāma episode in the Mbhr which show literal, or almost literal agreement with passages drawn from the R, in an effort to determine whether the former were borrowed from one recension, or from one version, or even from one manuscript to the exclusion of any other one. It is obvious that wherever all the Rāmāyaṇa manuscripts have the identical reading, such a closer definition of the source is impossible. But wherever a variant from the accepted text of the Rāmāyaṇa shows closer agreement

---

1. V. S. SUKTHANKAR, *The Rāma Episode (Rāmopākhyāna) and the Rāmāyaṇa*, in « A Volume of Studies in Indology », presented to P. V. Kane, 1941, pp. 472-87. See the references to Jacobi, Hopkins and Sluszkiewicz, p. 472 n. 1 and 2. See now also P. L. Vaidya in the introduction to the Critical Edition of the Yuddhakāṇḍa (pp. xxxi-vi) and V. Rāghavan in « The Greater Rāmāyaṇa » (Varaṇasī, 1973), pp. 11-31.

with the Mahābhārata text than the accepted Rāmāyaṇa text does, we have marked it and recorded it. In a few instances a variant in the Rāmāyaṇa manuscripts will agree not with the accepted Mahābhārata text but with one of its variants. These passages have been noted also.

In this study I have confined myself to the correspondences listed by Sukthankar in Appendix I « Critical Notes » of his edition of the *Vanaparvan* of the Mahābhārata (BORI 1942, pp. 1106-1108). Most of them are quite short, a quarter or at most half a verse. Sukthankar lists about 60, but of these about 30 proved to be unusable because they were literally the same in both the texts and their variants. The remaining 29 or 30 do furnish us with some evidence as to their provenance. There may be more such passages, since Sukthankar does not claim to have collected them all<sup>2</sup>, but I doubt whether they would affect the results of my findings. The evidence very clearly points to a borrowing by the Mahābhārata from a Northern text of the Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa and, with less certitude, to a Northeastern text.

### Correspondences

In the following paragraphs a Mahābhārata passage, with or without its variant readings, is listed followed by the corresponding passage in the Rāmāyaṇa, with its variants, if any. The symbols representing the mss. are listed in the conspectus below, p. 20. A designation such as « all NE mss. » means « all NE mss. used for that particular passage, in the Critical Edition ».

- 1) hatvā ḡṛdhrāṃ jaṭāyuṣam, Mbhr 3.258.2d no vvll.  
hatvā ḡṛdhrāṃ jaṭāyuṣam, VR 1.1.42d, found in all N mss. and D<sub>9</sub>, as a variant of ḡṛdhrāṃ hatvā jaṭāyuṣam.
- 2) kāmārūpabalānvitān, Mbhr 3.260.7d, no vvll.  
kāmārūpabalopetāḥ, VR 1.16.495\*:7a, an interpolation after 1.16.12 found in 15 S mss. and D<sub>109</sub>.
- 3) raṃjayām āsa hi prajāḥ Mbhr 3.261.6b in all S mss. exc. G<sub>3</sub>, as a variant to ramayām āsa hi prajāḥ.  
rañjayām āsa hi prajāḥ, VR 1.17.532\*:5, found in all NE mss. and D<sub>9,12</sub> as an interpolation. after 1.17.21.
- 4) saṃbhārāḥ saṃbhriyantām vai, Mbhr 3.261.15c in D<sub>c</sub> D<sub>n1</sub> D<sub>2</sub> as a variant to saṃbhārāḥ saṃbhriyantām me.  
saṃbhārāḥ saṃbhriyantām vai, VR 1.11.11c in M<sub>104</sub> (S) as a variant to saṃbhārāḥ saṃbhriyantām te.

2. SUKTHANKAR, *op. cit.*, pp. 476-77.

- 5) āśiviṣas tvām saṃkruddhaś caṇḍo daśatu durbhage Mbhr 3.261.17cd, in mss. B D G<sub>3</sub>, as a vl to ... daśati...  
āśiviṣas tvām daśatu mūḍhe paṇḍitamānini, VR 2.8.133\* found in all NE mss. (exc. N<sub>1</sub>) as an interpolation after 2.8.1.
- 6) pṛthivyām rājarājo 'smi, Mbhr 3.261.1245\*, found in all N mss. (exc. K<sub>1,3,4</sub>) and G<sub>3</sub> as an interpolation after 261.23.  
pṛthivyām rājarājo 'smi, VR 2.10.195\*, found in all NE mss. (exc. N) and 2 W (D<sub>1</sub> D<sub>201</sub>) as an interpolation after 10.12.
- 7) There are two variants of this passage, both found also in the Rāmāyaṇa:
- 7a) ābhiṣecanikaṃ yat te rāmārtham upakalpitam, Mbhr 3.261.25ab.  
ābhiṣecanikaṃ dravyaṃ rāmārtham upakalpitam, VR 2.13.260\*, found in all NE mss. and M<sub>204</sub> as a variant for 2.13.3cd abhiṣekāya rāmasya dvijendrain upakalpitam.
- 7b) abhiṣecanikaṃ yat..., Mbhr 3.261.25ab, in K<sub>3,4</sub> D<sub>4</sub> T<sub>2</sub> G<sub>1</sub>  
abhiṣecanikaṃ dravyaṃ..., R 2.13.261\*, found in 2 W mss. (D<sub>1</sub> D<sub>201</sub>) as a variant to 2.13.3cd.
- 8) kiṃvīryaḥ kiṃparākramaḥ, Mbhr 3.258.4b, no vvll.  
kiṃvīryaḥ kiṃparākramaḥ, R 3.32.2b, found in all NE mss., 2 NW mss. (Ś<sub>1</sub> D<sub>2</sub>) and D<sub>9</sub>, as a vl. to kiṃrūpaḥ kiṃparākramaḥ.
- 9) viśeyaṃ vā hutāśanam, Mbhr 3.262.27d, no vvll.  
praviśeyaṃ hutāśanaṃ, R 3.43.34b, in all NE mss. (exc. B<sub>103</sub>), 2 NW mss. (Ś<sub>1</sub> D<sub>1</sub>) and D<sub>9</sub>, as a vl. to pravekṣyāmi hutāśanam.
- 10) This entry has two variants in both texts:
- 10a) vyapaviddhabṛṣikaṭam, Mbhr 3.263.22b, in T G<sub>1,2,4</sub> as a variant of 10b).  
vipraviddhabṛṣ (or -s-)ikaṭam, R 3.58.7<sup>b</sup> in the W recension (2 mss.).
- 10b) vyapaviddhabṛṣīghaṭam, in N and the remaining S.  
vipraviddhabṛṣ (or -s-)ighaṭam in all NW and NE.
- 11) haṃsakāraṇḍavāyutā Mbhr 3.263.40b with vl °sevitā (G<sub>4</sub>).  
haṃsakāraṇḍavāyutāṃ, R 4.1.43b, in three NE mss. (N<sub>2</sub> V<sub>401</sub> B<sub>1</sub>) and D<sub>9</sub> as a variant to kāraṇḍavanisevitām.
- 12) kā tvarā maraṇe punaḥ, Mbhr 3.264.27d, N and M, corresponds to kā tvarā maraṇe punaḥ, R 4.16.331\* in N NE.  
A variant with tava for punaḥ is found in both Mbhr (mss. D<sub>c</sub> D<sub>1,2</sub>) and R (D<sub>9</sub>, a N-E ms.).
- 13) sa mālayā tadā vīraḥ śuśubhe kaṇṭhaśaktayā, Mbhr 3.264.34ab, the accepted text as found in N (exc. K<sub>3,4</sub> D<sub>1</sub>) and G<sub>3</sub>.  
sa mālayā tadā vīraḥ śuśubhe kaṇṭhaśaktayā, R 4.12.37ab as found

in Ś Ñ V<sub>1</sub> D<sub>1,2,4</sub>, i.e. mss. of the NW W and NE recensions, as a variant to: sa tathā śuśubhe vīra latayā kaṇṭhasaktayā.

- 14) There are two variants in both texts of this passage:
  - 14a) mukhāc choṇitam udvaman, Mbhr 3.264.37b, S (exc. G<sub>3</sub>).  
mukhāc choṇitam udvaman, R 4.47.19b, Ś<sub>1</sub> D<sub>2,12</sub> Ñ<sub>1</sub>, all N mss.
  - 14b) vaktrāc choṇitam udvaman, Mbhr 3.264.37b, N (exc. V) and G<sub>3</sub>.  
vaktrāc choṇitam udvaman, R 4.47.19b, S and V, the accepted text.
- 15) The following passage occurs once in the Mbhr, with minor variants, and twice in the R, both times with important variants. The variants for the second occurrence of the passage however, (R 6.32.21ab) do not seem to be the source of the Mbhr reading and so have been omitted.
  - 15a) golāṅgūlo mahārājā gavākṣo nāma vānaraḥ, Mbhr 3.267.4cd in ms. D<sub>5</sub> only, corresponds to:  
golāṅgūlo mahārājō gavākṣo nāma vānaraḥ, R 4.38.18ab in the mss. Ñ<sub>2</sub> V<sub>1</sub> B<sub>1,103,304</sub> D<sub>9</sub>, all NE mss.
  - 15b) golāṅgūlo mahārāja gavākṣo bhīmavikramaḥ, Mbhr 3.267.4cd in mss. K<sub>1,3</sub> D<sub>1</sub>, corresponds to:  
golāṅgūlo mahārājō gavākṣo bhīmavikramaḥ, R 4.38.18ab in mss. Ñ<sub>1</sub> V<sub>1</sub> D<sub>6,10,11</sub> T<sub>2,3</sub> G<sub>1,2</sub> M<sub>1,3</sub>, or all S (exc. D<sub>5,7</sub> G<sub>3</sub>) and Ñ<sub>1</sub> V<sub>1</sub>.
- 16) cāturvarṇyasya rakṣitā, Mbhr 3.621.1245\*, in an interpolation found in N (exc. K<sub>1,3,4</sub>) and G<sub>3</sub>.  
cāturvarṇyasya rakṣitā, R 5.33.11b S W and D<sub>8</sub>, the accepted text.
- 17) tāpasīveśadhārīṇī, Mbhr 3.264.42b, with vlll -veśa- in K<sub>1,2</sub>.  
tāpasīveśadhārīṇī, R 5.13.415\*:3b, in an interpolation after vs. 37 in most NE mss. (exc. Ñ<sub>1</sub>).
- 18) The following passage occurs in two versions in both Mbhr and R:
  - 18a) avamdhyo nāma medhāvī vṛddho rākṣasapuṃgavaḥ, Mbhr 3.264.55ab, in mss. K<sub>4</sub> D<sub>1</sub>.  
avamdhyo nāma medhāvī vidvān rākṣasapuṃgavaḥ, R 5.35.12a, in ms. D<sub>1</sub>.
  - 18b) avindhyo nāma medhāvī vṛddho rākṣasapuṃgavaḥ, Mbhr 3.264.55ab, all other mss.  
avindhyo nāma medhāvī vidvān rākṣasapuṃgavaḥ, R. Ś<sub>1</sub> and S. the accepted text.
- 19) There are two readings for the following passage:
  - 19a) śvetam parvatam ārūḍha eka eva vibhīṣaṇaḥ, Mbhr 3.264.66cd, ms. K<sub>3</sub>.

śvetam parvatam ārūḍha eka eva vibhīṣaṇaḥ, R 5.25.617\*, in an interpolation after verse 25 found in D<sub>4.8</sub>.

- 19b) śvetaparvatam ārūḍha eka eva vibhīṣaṇaḥ, Mbhr 3.264.66cd, accepted text.  
śvetaparvatam ārūḍhas tv eka eva vibhīṣaṇaḥ R 5.25.617\*, in mss. N<sub>1</sub> B<sub>4</sub> D<sub>2.3.9</sub>.
- 20) There are two readings for the following passage:
- 20a) caturbhiḥ saha rākṣasaiḥ, Mbhr 3.267.46d in G<sub>4</sub>.  
caturbhiḥ saha rākṣasaiḥ, R 6.10.12d and 11.5b, in mss. of the S recension and N<sub>2</sub> V<sub>1.4</sub> B<sub>1-2.4</sub> D<sub>9</sub>, Ś<sub>2</sub> D<sub>12</sub>. It is the accepted reading.
- 20b) caturbhiḥ sacivaiḥ saha, Mbhr 3.267.46d, accepted text.  
caturbhiḥ sacivaiḥ saha, R 6.10.12d and 11.5 in most N and no S mss.
- 21) hantāsmi tvām sahāmatyaṃ, Mbhr 3.268.15a, in Ś K B<sub>1</sub> D<sub>cl</sub> D<sub>1.2</sub> TG<sub>1.2.4</sub>, corresponds to:  
hantāsmi tvām sahāmatyaṃ R 6.31.68a N V<sub>1.2</sub> and S (exc. T<sub>2.3</sub> G<sub>1</sub> M<sub>1</sub>), the accepted reading.
- 22) kṛtakarmā vibhīṣaṇaḥ, Mbhr 3.273.5b, accepted text.  
kṛtakarmā vibhīṣaṇaḥ, R 6.39.31b, N only, as a variant to the accepted reading: sthāpayitvā vibhīṣaṇaḥ.
- 23) śarān āśīviṣopamān, Mbhr 3.273.20d.  
śarān āśīviṣopamān, R 6.76.5b, in N (exc. D<sub>1.3</sub> B<sub>1</sub>) and D<sub>10</sub> D<sub>11</sub> T<sub>1</sub> G<sub>2</sub>, as a variant to: śarān agniśikhopamān.
- 24) There are two versions of the following passage:
- 24a) yāvad bhūmir bhaviṣyati, Mbhr 3.275.48d, M<sub>1</sub>.  
yāvad bhūmir bhaviṣyati, R 6.88.53d, ŚD<sub>8.12.13</sub>.
- 24b) yāvad bhūmir dhariṣyati, Mbhr 3.275.48d, accepted text.  
yāvad bhūmir dhariṣyati, R 6.88.53d, all other N and S, the accepted text.
- 25) puṣpakeṇa vimānena khecareṇa virājatā, Mbhr 3.275.52ab.  
khecareṇa vimānena kāmāgena virājatā, R 6.110.23ab B<sub>1</sub> D<sub>1-3</sub>, as a variant to the accepted text: yayau tena vimānena hamsayuktena bhāsvatā.
- 26) daśāśvameghān ājahre jāruthyān sa nirargalān, Mbhr 3.275.69<sup>cd</sup>  
Ś K<sub>3.4</sub> B<sub>2.4</sub> D (exc. D<sub>1</sub>) G<sub>3</sub> M<sub>2</sub>.  
daśāśvameghān ājahre jāruthyān anirargalān, R 6.116.82cd, B<sub>1</sub>, as a variant to the accepted reading: śatāśvameghān ājahre sadaśvān bhūridakṣiṇān.

## Discussion

In the preceding paragraphs I have listed 26 passages consisting of quarter verses and half-verses, showing correspondences between the Rāmopākhyāna and various manuscripts of the Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa.

A few of the correspondences are not as cogent as evidence for borrowing as others are. For instance, the substitution of *vai* for *me* or *te* at the end of a śloka (no. 4), or the variant *br̥ṣīghaṭa-* for *br̥ṣīkaṭa* (no. 10), as well as the transposition of words in a śloka (no. 1) do not by themselves furnish strong evidence for this borrowing. However cumulatively and viewed in conjunction with the many correspondences of the Mbhr text with interpolations in the accepted text of the Rāmāyaṇa (nos. 3, 6, 17), the data present an undeniable impression that borrowings from certain mss. of the Rāmāyaṇa to the exclusion of others is genuine.

There can be little doubt that the majority of the passages listed present significant evidence that certain of the R mss. to the exclusion of others have served as the source for the Rāma episode in the Mbhr. Three questions can be raised immediately:

- 1) Is it possible to determine the ms., or version or recension of the R which has been the source for the Rāma episode?
- 2) Is it possible to determine whether the episode was borrowed into one particular ms., version, or recension of the Mbhr?
- 3) Is it possible to determine the point in time in the text history of the epics when this borrowing took place?

The answers to these questions are to some degree influenced by the text-historical model we adopt for the transmission of the epic texts. Anyone who has worked on both epics is aware of the differences in the character of their texts. The Mbhr text characteristically is less fluid and presents fewer variations to the accepted text than the Rāmāyaṇa. Although both texts have been edited with the same set of rigorous text-critical standards, the Rāmāyaṇa has many more instances where the selection of the critical readings is more doubtful, more subject to controversy than is the case with the Mbhr. This greater fluidity of the R text suggests that it has been preserved as an oral epic up to a more recent date than the Mbhr. In spite of these differences, the model adopted by the editors of the Rāmāyaṇa is the following: from the hypothetical original text, a version came into existence in Northern India which at a fairly early date spread to South India, thus creating a « Southern recension ». Both Northern and Southern recensions continued developing more or less independently, with this difference that the Southern recension tended to be more conservative in comparison

with its northern counterpart. The Northern recension developed two or three versions of its own (W, NW, NE) which differed in wording, interpolations, omissions and grammar. The Southern recension was written in at least three scripts, besides Devanāgarī, each of which qualified as a version in its own right. So at the commencement of their work the editors of the Rāmāyaṇa were faced with numerous mss. that required to be allocated to certain versions which in turn could be grouped into recensions. In the case of a conflict between northern and southern readings preference was given to the Southern recension, because it had remained exempt from the random alterations and interpolations that had occurred to the N texts as a result of their continued transmission in a land where Indo-Aryan languages were spoken and developing.

### *Date of Borrowing*

For simplicity's sake, we shall adopt this model of the development of the Rāmāyaṇa texts. If we then inquire in what period the Mbhr may have borrowed from the R, there are a priori two possible periods: either before or after the Southern recension of the Rāmāyaṇa had branched off. In the first instance we could expect the point of correspondence between the R and the Rāma episode to be consistent in both N and S recensions. The N may have elaborated some of the passages more fully and omitted others, but by and large the number of differences should not be significantly different. If on the other hand the borrowing took place after the branching off of the S recension, again there are two possibilities: the Mbhr borrowed either from the N recension or from the S. If the episode had been borrowed from the S, we would expect all passages to agree with the S and only a limited number with the N viz. in those instances where the N had borrowed verses from the S.

If on the other hand, the Rāma episode had been borrowed from the N recension, the majority of agreements would be with mss. of this recension and those agreements that would match S readings would be either passages that had belonged to the «original» text before the split took place, or else later borrowings from the N by the S. There would not be any agreements of Mbhr passages with the S mss only.

With these theoretical considerations in mind let us now examine the results of the comparison. The accompanying table I shows those passages where the Mbhr readings agree with readings of the S recension of the Rāmāyaṇa. They are grouped by versions (Devanāgarī, Telugu, Grantha, Malayālam) in columns to show whether they are exclusive to the S recension or are shared by one or more of the N versions. A few points are obvious:

1) Only a few of the passages common to the two epics are found in the S recension. In fact, only eleven out of the possible 28 or so have correspondents in the S.

2) Except for no. 4, not a single corresponding passage is confined to the S recension only. All the remainder are found at least once in the N also. The exception is a trifling substitution of *vai* for *te* at the end of a verse and is one of the weakest pieces of evidence for a common origin.

3) On the whole, any of the passages in the S recensions is shared by all other S mss. Exceptions are 6, 7, 4. This fact points to a single original S recension from which each version derives.

TABLE I  
*Correspondences of the Rāmopākhyāna with  
the Southern Recension of the R*

Shared with Northern Recension	Version				Total
	Devanagari	Telugu	Grantha	Malayalam	
	(D <sub>5-7,10-11</sub> )	(T <sub>1-102</sub> )	(G)	(M)	
W	2	2	2	2	1
NW	18b	18b	X	X	1
NE	15, 21	14, 15, 21	14, 15, 21	7 <sup>a</sup> , 14, 15, 21	4
W NW	—	—	—	—	—
W NE	23	—	23	—	1
NW NE	20a	20a	20a	20a	1
W NW NE	24b	24b	24b	6, 24b	2
exclusive S	—	—	—	4	1
other S only	—	—	—	—	—
					11

(An X indicates that no mss. were available for that passage).

(A number refers to the numbers listed above under «Correspondences»).

4) Three-quarters of the correspondences in the S recension are shared by the S and the NE version of the N recension. That would point to a strong influence of this recension in the branching off of the S.



From these facts we can conclude that the Rāma episode in the Mbhr was not borrowed from the S recension of the Mbhr. We can draw one more conclusion: if the borrowing had taken place before the S recension had branched off, one can argue that then the S would have contained about as many correspondences as the N. Since that is not the case, and since almost all its correspondences are also in N, it is clear that the Southern recension of the Rāmāyaṇa branched off after the Rāma episode had been adopted into the Mahābhārata.

We can now examine the N recension and try to determine whether any of its versions may have served as the source for the Rāma episode to the exclusion of the other ones. In Table II the evidence is tabulated. For each version (W NW NE) the passages are listed in accordance with their exclusive or joint occurrence with other versions. The results are not entirely unambiguous. Of the 31 passages, 13 occur in the W, 19 in N, and 25 in NE. It is clear that the majority of the borrowed passages occur in the NE version and it would be tempting to conclude that this version was the sole source for the Rāma episode. However, six passages have been borrowed that occur in the W and/or NW only and they cannot be disposed of easily. Two of them, passages 10a) and 19a), may or may not record important variants *br̥sikaṭam* for *br̥sīgha-ṭam* and *śvetam parvatam* for *śvetaparvatam*, respectively, but the statements in passages 2), 16), 18a), and 18b) contain variants which cannot be attributed to mere chance. Passage 16), for example, *cāturvarṇyasya rakṣitā*, is used in the Mbhr to describe King Janaka and in the R to describe Rāma, but in the latter work it occurs only once and in the Mbhr here in an interpolation and only once more (3.61.41d). In other words it is not a commonplace formula.

TABLE II

*Passages in the Northern Recension of the Rāmāyaṇa*

Version	Passage Number	Total	All W	All NW	All NE
W exclusive	2, 10a	2	2		
NW exclusive	18a, 18b	2		2	
NE exclusive	5, 7, 11, 12a, 12b, 15a, 15b, 17, 21	9			9
W+NW	16, 19a	2	2	2	
W+NE	23	1	1		1
NW+NE	3, 8, 9, 10b, 20a, 24b, 24a	7		7	7
W+NW+NE	1, 6, 13, 14a, 20b, 22, 25	8	8	8	2
Totals		31	13	19	25

In conformity with these facts we have to conclude that the Rāma episode was borrowed from a version that was very close to the reconstructed NE version but also contained passages found now only in the W and NW. The large number of passages shared by NW and NE (15) points to a rather closer connection between these versions than between the W and NW at that time.

The evidence, furthermore, shows that there is a paradoxical situation in the text history of the Rāmāyaṇa: on the one hand the Rāma episode has borrowed from a NW-NE precursor of the present texts; on the other hand the S recension has derived from a text heavily influenced by the NE version. In the model proposed by the editors of the Cr. Ed. the NE version has been accorded a place at the same rank as NW W. It would seem that the text-historical model might need revision and that perhaps the NE version should be given a more prominent place in the earlier stages of the development of the text. Alternatively, and perhaps closer to the truth than the model proposed, is a conception of a set of recited texts existing side by side in various oral versions, with some disappearing without leaving a trace and others surviving as mss. that now, several centuries later, call for a slot in the monolithic stemma. This model for the R is more attractive but at the same time begs the question of a responsible text reconstruction. As such it should not remain more than a hypothetical model.

One can next raise the question which of the groups of mss. of the NE recension is closest to an ancestor from which the Rāma episode derived. That question cannot be answered in any satisfactory way, as Table III shows: of the 25 occurrences of common passages, none of the ms. groups has a clear majority. The conclusion must be that the ancestor gave rise to all the separate script versions. But even this conclusion does not carry too much weight. It should be implemented with detailed studies of the versions and their lineage using more passages than the Rāma episode provides.

### *The Mahābhārata*

One may want to use the same method that we have applied to the Rāmāyaṇa to try to determine which recension of the Mbhr had borrowed the Rāma episode. There are problems here. For one thing, most of the passages listed agree with the accepted text of the Mbhr supported by the full weight of the critical apparatus, so that it is difficult to isolate any particular version. Furthermore, as was mentioned earlier, the accepted text of the Mbhr has relatively fewer variants per verse than the R text. I intend to pursue this matter on another occasion,

but from the present material it appears that the Mbhr mss. signalled by the Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa are equally distributed between N and S, without preference for any recension. By itself that fact would point to unexpected evidence that the Rāma episode was borrowed into the Māhābhārata before the latter split up into a N and S recension.

TABLE III

*Passages in the NE version of the Rāmāyaṇa*

ms. group	Passage Number	Total	All D	All Ñ	All V	All B
D exclusive	12a, 24a	2	2			
Ñ exclusive	14a	1		1		
V exclusive	14b, 20a	2			2	
B exclusive	25	1				1
D+N		0				
D+V		0				
D+B		0				
Ñ+V	13, 15b	2		2	2	
Ñ+B		0				
V+B	6	1			1	1
D+Ñ+V	21	1	1	1	1	
D+Ñ+B	8, 10b, 17	3	3	3		3
D+V+B	15a	1	1		1	1
Ñ+V+B	5, 7, 12b	3		3	3	3
D+Ñ+V+B	1, 3, 9, 11, 20b, 22, 23, 24b	8	8	8	8	8
Totals		25	15	18	18	17

CONSPECTUS OF MANUSCRIPTS OF THE VĀLMIKI RĀMĀYAṆA REFERRED TO

1. Western Version.

D <sub>3</sub>	Ujjain no. 5600, A.D. 1731, used for Ar Ki Su Yu.
D <sub>4</sub>	Jodhpur Bandha no. 5, 1732, used for Ki Su Yu.
D <sub>103</sub>	Baroda Or. Inst. no. 3937, 1717, used for Bā Ay (D <sub>3</sub> ).
D <sub>109</sub>	Vallabha-Vidyanagar. 1848, used for Bā (D <sub>4</sub> ), Ay (D <sub>3</sub> ), Ki (D <sub>11</sub> ).
D <sub>201</sub>	Baroda Or. Inst. no. 14142, 1455, used for Ay only (D <sub>1</sub> ).

## 2. North-Western Version.

- Ś<sub>1</sub> Sāradā ms. Baroda Or. Inst. no. 14061, n.d., used for all kāṇḍas.  
 Ś<sub>2</sub> New Delhi, privately owned, n.d., Yu (sarga 11 ff.), Ut.  
 D<sub>1</sub> Poona BORI 825, 1594 (Bāla); 1773 (remaining kāṇḍas), used for Bā Ay (D<sub>2</sub>), Ar Ki Su Yu (D<sub>1</sub>). Classified as « Western » in Bā Ay Ki Su.  
 D<sub>2</sub> Baroda Or. Inst. no. 12864, 1581, used for Bā (D<sub>3</sub>), Ar Ki Su Yu (D<sub>2</sub>).  
 D<sub>8</sub> Jodhpur Bandha no. 5, 1779, used for Ki (D<sub>11</sub>), Su (D<sub>11</sub>), Yu (D<sub>8</sub>).  
 D<sub>12</sub> Jodhpur Bandha no. 4, n.d., used for Bā (D<sub>11</sub>), Ki Yu (D<sub>12</sub>), Su (D<sub>10</sub>).  
 D<sub>107</sub> Hoshiarpur no. 1805, 1817, Bā only (D<sub>7</sub>).  
 D<sub>111</sub> Hoshiarpur no. 2967, n.d., Bā only (D<sub>11</sub>).

## 3. North-Eastern Version.

## a) Devanāgarī mss.

- D<sub>13</sub> Varanasi, privately owned, n.d., used for Yuddha only.  
 D<sub>307</sub> Hoshiarpur, VVRI no. 3018, 1829, Ar only.

## b) Nepali mss.

- N<sub>1</sub> Baroda Or. Inst. no. 14156; A.D. 1020, used for all kāṇḍas.  
 N<sub>2</sub> Baroda Or. Inst. no. 14157; A.D. 1675, used for all kāṇḍas.

## c) Maithili mss.

- V<sub>1</sub> Baroda Or. Inst. no. 4, Addenda, 1748, used for Ar. (V<sub>2</sub>), Ki (V<sub>3</sub>), Su Yu Utt (V<sub>1</sub>).  
 V<sub>2</sub> Baroda Or. Inst. no. 57, Addenda, 1841, used for Yu Ut.  
 V<sub>3</sub> Darbhanga, Mithila Res. Inst. no. 807, undated, used for Yu Utt.  
 V<sub>101, 102, 103, 104</sub> Baroda Or. Inst. nos. 14137, 14133, 14130 and 14134, 1360, 1559, 1831, 1836, resp. used for Bā.  
 V<sub>201</sub> Baroda Or. Inst. from Darbhanga, n.d., used for Ay only.  
 V<sub>401</sub> Darbhanga no. 809, n.d., used for Ki only.  
 V<sub>402</sub> Baroda Or. Inst. no. 4 Addenda, 1648, used for Ki only.

## d) Bengālī mss.

- B<sub>1</sub> Copy of Paris Bibl. Nat. no. 348, 1671, used for all kāṇḍas.  
 B<sub>2</sub> Calcutta Bāṅgīya Sāhitya Pariṣad no. 4139 (ka), 1798, used for Yu Ut (B<sub>2</sub>).  
 B<sub>3</sub> Calcutta, Asiatic Soc. Bengal no. G 393, n.d., used for Su (B<sub>2</sub>), Yu (B<sub>3</sub>), Ut (B<sub>2</sub>).  
 B<sub>4</sub> Calcutta, Bang. Sāh. Par. no. 1168, n.d., used for Yu only.  
 B<sub>102</sub> Śāntiniketan Viśvabhāratī no. 776, 1789, used for Bā, Ay Ar (B<sub>2</sub>).  
 B<sub>103</sub> Calc. As. Soc. of Bengal no. G395, 1832, used for Bā Ay Ar (B<sub>3</sub>) and Ki (B<sub>3</sub>).  
 B<sub>104</sub> Id. no II.A.39, n.d., used for Bā only (B<sub>4</sub>).  
 B<sub>204</sub> Calc. Univ. Libr. no. 764, n.d., used for Ay only (B<sub>4</sub>).  
 B<sub>304</sub> Calc. As. Soc. of Bengal no. G4430, n.d., used for Ar (B<sub>4</sub>) and Ki (B<sub>3</sub>).  
 B<sub>404</sub> Cal. Bāṅgīya Sāhitya Pariṣad no. 1434 (kha), 1798, used for Ki only (B<sub>4</sub>).  
 B<sub>503-4</sub> Calc. Bāṅgīya Sāhitya Pariṣad no. 94 and 1434 (gha), resp. used for Su only (B<sub>3</sub>, 4).

## II. Southern Recension.

## 1) Devanāgarī mss.

- D<sub>5</sub> Ujjain no. 1357, 1766, used for Ar (D<sub>4</sub>), Ki Yu Ut (D<sub>5</sub>).

- D<sub>6</sub> Baroda Professor Bhatt, 1774, used for all kāṇḍas: Bā (D<sub>6</sub>), Ay (D<sub>61</sub>), Ar (D<sub>61</sub>), Ki Yu Ut (D<sub>6</sub>), Su (D<sub>5</sub>).  
 D<sub>7</sub> Poona no. 844, 1776, used for Ar (D<sub>61</sub>), Su (D<sub>6</sub>), Yu Ut (D<sub>7</sub>).  
 D<sub>9</sub> Ujjain no. 1611, 1781, used for Bā (D<sub>10</sub>), Ay (D<sub>6</sub>), Ar (D<sub>5</sub>), Ki (D<sub>7</sub>), Su (D<sub>6</sub>), Yu Ut (D<sub>6</sub>).  
 D<sub>10</sub> Ujjain no. 1633, 1831, used for Bā Ki (D<sub>6</sub>), Su (D<sub>7</sub>), Yu Ut (D<sub>10</sub>).  
 D<sub>11</sub> Jodhpur unnumbered, n.d., used for Bā (D<sub>1</sub>), Ay Ar (D<sub>11</sub>), Ki (D<sub>10</sub>), Su (D<sub>9</sub>), Yu Ut (D<sub>11</sub>).

2) Telugu mss.

- T<sub>1</sub> Madras Adyar no. 72372, n.d., used for all kāṇḍas.  
 T<sub>2</sub> Id. no. 75597, n.d., used for Bā Ay Ar (T<sub>3</sub>), Ki Su Yu (T<sub>2</sub>).  
 T<sub>3</sub> Id. no. 74122, 1808, used for Ki Su Yu Ut (T<sub>3</sub>).  
 T<sub>102</sub> Id. no. 72393, n.d., used for Bā only (T<sub>2</sub>).

3) Grantha mss.

- G<sub>1</sub> Baroda no. 6362, 1818, used for all kāṇḍas.  
 G<sub>2</sub> Trippunithura no. 152, n.d., used for all kāṇḍas.  
 G<sub>3</sub> Ahmedabad, privately owned, n.d., used for all kāṇḍas.

4) Malayālam mss.

- M<sub>1</sub> Trippunithura no. 158, 1690, used for Bā Ay (M<sub>2</sub>), Ar Ki Su Yu (M<sub>1</sub>).  
 M<sub>2</sub> Id. no. 953, 1642, used for Su Utt.  
 M<sub>3</sub> Chundampatta, n.d., used for Ki Su Yu Ut.  
 M<sub>5</sub> Trivandrum no. 13366, n.d., used for Yu Ut.  
 M<sub>103</sub> Kumplangad, 1823, used for Bā (M<sub>3</sub>), Ar Ki (M<sub>2</sub>).  
 M<sub>104</sub> Trippunithura no. 159, n.d., used for Bā (M<sub>1</sub>), Ay (M<sub>3</sub>).  
 M<sub>204</sub> Chunangad, privately owned, n.d., used for Ay (M<sub>4</sub>), Ar (M<sub>3</sub>). It shows «influence of the N recension», Introduction AyK. p. xix.